

Message

From: Capacasa, Jon [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=85A0B5B637AB47F4B93C10CC822A7FDB-JCAPACAS]
Sent: 6/3/2015 2:30:50 PM
To: saxe, jennie [saxe.jennie@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OW visit
Attachments: Capacasa Improving our Measures of Incremental Progress for Clean.pptx; 3rd T_Fikslin and J_Capacasa.EPA_State_Interstate Water Directors Meeting.pdf

Ok – will try to work down the list.

Could I ask for your PPT help. I will be probably about a dozen or so slides to highlight 4 examples of incremental progress stories.

Attached is my slide set (CAPACASA file) with some placeholder slides. I am trying to incorporate a few slides from the Tom Fikslin presentation attached which unfortunately are in pdf format. Slides 1,8-15, 17 and 20.

And still need to add a Slide on Bay Barometer Water Quality indicator.

That's it.

Lori-'s slides can be appended to this with a subtitle slide to introduce and I will hand off to her after some discussion.

Thanks

From: saxe, jennie
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2015 10:12 AM
To: Capacasa, Jon
Subject: RE: OW visit

Thanks, Jon! How did you know I had a list? Here are the items, in priority order:

- **Incremental progress** – you should touch base with Lori to discuss how you want to merge your slides/talking points with the CWSRF environmental benefits topic (she was looking for clarification)
- **Performance slide bullets** – see my message from yesterday 1:51 pm – any comments?
- **Water Sustains Us session** - any comments on that session/opening day 2 (see my message this morning to Dom & Lori, cc to you)
- **All-hands session save-the-date** (message from me yesterday afternoon): we should send that whenever you think it's appropriate. I think there were a few weeks' notice for the Cynthia Giles all-hands, but I'll leave the decision to you
- **Performance discussion:** I took a look at how the regional "rankings" might change with 5% and 10% "incentives" for more ambitious commitments. (Basically a multiplier of 1.05 or 1.1 for regions with ambitiousness above the regional average.) Also ran the numbers with and without a "penalty" (0.95 and 0.9 multipliers) for less ambitious commitments. Here's how it came out. Not sure if you want to use this or not. If you do, there are a couple of different ways to graph it. Just let me know.

ranking from OW - based on "% commitments met" alone	5% "incentive" (1.05 and 0.95 multipliers)	5%, no "penalty" (only 1.05 multiplier for more ambitious regions)	10% "incentive" (0.9 and 1.1 multipliers)	10%, no "penalty" (only 1.1 multiplier for more ambitious regions)
1	5	5	5	5 highest ranking region
4	2	1	2	2
5	1	4	3	1
2	6	2	6	4
6	4	6	9	3
9	9	9	8	6
7	3	7	1	9
8	8	3	4	7
3	7	8	7	8
10	10	10	10	10 lowest ranking region

From: Capacasa, Jon
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2015 9:43 AM
To: saxe, jennie
Subject: OW visit

I am going to work on the PPT slides for Incremental Progress discussion.

Anything else on your short list that you need my attention to today?

Jon M. Capacasa, P.E.
 Director
 Water Protection Division
 EPA Region III
 1650 Arch Street
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 215-814-5422
capacasa.jon@epa.gov